

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 18 2006

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed May 30, 2006 (hereinafter, "Final Office Action"), Applicant has canceled previously withdrawn claims 14-30 without prejudice, comment or disclaimer. Additionally, Applicant has amended claims 1, 33 and 34 and added new claims 35-37. Claims 1, 35 and 37 are independent claims and the total number of claims now pending is 20. Accordingly, Applicant believes that no claim fees are due. However, if it is determined that additional claim fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the remarks presented below.

Applicant respectfully traverses, with amendment, the rejection of claims 1-13 and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,956,848 ("Keung") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0141596 ("Crockett") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,999,930 ("Roberts") at page 2, paragraph 4 of the Final Office Action.

Keung discloses a centralized switching system for connecting a caller to a centralized auto-attendant. *See Keung*, Col. 13, lines 13-15. Additionally, Keung discloses that multiple instances of the auto-attendant systems may be located on a particular destination telecommunication system. *See Keung*, Column 13, lines 59-61. Additionally, Keung discloses that auto-attendant requests from different systems may be routed to the appropriate instance of the auto-attendant on the destination system. *See Keung*, col. 13, lines 61-63. Crockett discloses a system that provides enhanced Advanced Intelligent Network (AIN) call services using a voice extensible markup language (VXML) server to enable communication between a calling party and the public switched telephone network. *See Crockett*, p. 2, paragraph 0072. Crockett also discloses that the VXML platform is programmed. *See Crockett*, p. 5, paragraph 0092.

The Final Office Action acknowledges the Keung and Crockett are silent about processing the received data to construct grammars. *See Final Office Action*, p. 3, paragraph 4. Roberts is asserted as disclosing construction of new and updated grammars. *See Final Office Action*, p. 4, paragraph 4.

Roberts discloses that grammars are generated based on data contained in backend systems 116. *See Roberts*, col. 8, lines 26-40. The backend systems 116 of Roberts are shown to be connected to the mobile application server 112 and coupled to the voice dialog server 106. *See Roberts*, FIG. 1. Roberts discloses that the backend systems 116 are represented in a voice dialog server 106 using sets of rules and a data-driven framework. *See Roberts*, col. 6, lines 13-14.

In contrast to Roberts, claim 1 recites a network based voice activated auto-attendant system including a data connector to receive data from a remote enterprise information system via a public network and to process the received data to construct grammars for use by the enterprise voice directory and the database of voice directory grammars. Roberts discloses constructing grammars from a local backend system and makes no mention of constructing grammars from data received from a remote enterprise information system via a public network. Roberts fails to disclose a data connector to receive data from a remote enterprise information system via a public network and to process the received data to construct grammars, as recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, the asserted combination of Keung, Crockett, and Roberts fails to disclose or suggest a network based voice activated auto-attendant system including a data connector to receive data from a remote enterprise information system via a public network and to process the received data to construct grammars for use by the enterprise voice directory and the database of voice directory grammars, as recited by claim 1. Thus, the asserted combination of Keung, Crockett, and Roberts fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of independent claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 over the asserted combination of Keung, Crockett, and Roberts is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-13 and 31-34 depend from allowable independent claim 1. Therefore, the asserted combination of Keung, Crockett and Roberts fails to disclose at least one element of each of the claims 2-13 and 31-34, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-13 and 31-34 should be withdrawn.

New claims 35-37 are added. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a system including a data connector responsive to a public network to receive

data from remote enterprise information systems and to dynamically construct grammars from the received data, as recited by claim 35. Additionally, none of the references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a system including an enterprise voice service platform to store the dynamically constructed grammars from a first remote enterprise information system in a first directory and from a second remote enterprise system in a second directory, where the enterprise voice service platform is to provide a first voice service to a first set of incoming calls based on the first directory and a second voice service to a second set of incoming calls based on the second directory, as recited by claim 35.

None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a system including a data connector that is adapted to receive updated data from the remote enterprise information systems and to dynamically update the dynamically constructed grammars based on the received updated data, as recited by claim 36.

None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a system including a data connector responsive to one or more remote enterprise information systems to receive data via a public network and to process the received data, where the data connector is to construct grammars to produce an enterprise voice directory for each of the one or more remote enterprise information systems, as recited by claim 37. Moreover, none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a voice activated auto-attendant to host the enterprise voice directory of each of the one or more remote enterprise information systems, where the voice activated auto-attendant is to receive an incoming telephone call directed to a called number and to process the telephone call using the enterprise voice directory associated with the called number, as recited by claim 37. Accordingly, claims 35-37 are allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.


Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

7-18-2006
Date


Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)